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Overview

• Department *does not* make recommendation for preferred alternative
  – support any individual stakeholder proposal

• Purpose of review: To ensure proposals meet Department guidelines and goals of MLPA

Proposals Outcomes:
• Proposals have converged significantly
  – Locations
  – MPA design

• Differences exist in
  – Proposed regulations
  – Inclusion/exclusion of individual MPAs
Department Concerns

Concerns Include

• Inadequate improvements to existing MPAs
• Lack of boundary or regulation clarity or difficulties with enforcement
• Incomplete development of reasonable and measurable goals and objectives
• MPAs unnecessary to fulfill the MLPA mandate and with inadequate protection
Existing MPAs

Inadequate Improvements to Existing MPAs

- Boundary concerns not addressed
- Level of protection not improved
  - Due to liberal take allowances, intertidal boundaries, etc…

MPAs include
- Del Mar
- Duxbury Reef (intertidal portions)
Existing MPAs: Del Mar

Not Improved
- Boundaries do not meet guidelines
- Allows most existing take to continue

Improved
- Boundaries meet guidelines
- LOP increased

Proposal 1-3

Proposal 4

Del Mar Landing SMP Proposal 1-3

Del Mar Landing SMR Proposal 4
Existing MPAs: Duxbury Reef area

Science guidelines
• Not recommended
• Should extend to deeper waters
• Allows most existing take

Feasibility
• Difficult to enforce
• Confusing boundaries (distance offshore)

Proposals:
- Proposal 1-3: Duxbury Reef SMCA Proposal 1-3
- Proposal 2-XA: Duxbury SMP Proposal 2-XA
- Proposal 4: Agate Beach Intertidal SMCA Proposal 4
Feasibility: Boundaries, Regulations

**MPAs with boundary concerns**
- Del Mar Landing SMP (1-3)
- Bodega Head SMCA (1-3); SMR (4)
- Duxbury Reef area (All)
- Black Point SMCA & SMR (2-XA)

**MPAs with multiple zoning concerns**
- Duxbury Reef area (4)

**MPAs with designation/ regulation concerns**
- Estuary SMRs should use SMRMAs where waterfowl hunting occurs
- Fisheries management measure
  - Russian River SMCA (2-XA)
Boundary Feasibility: Bodega Head

Diagonal line
- Difficult to enforce
- Decreases public understanding

Proposal 1-3
Boundary Feasibility: Black Point

Proposal 2-XA

Diagonal line
- Not anchored at whole minutes
- Difficult to enforce
- Decreases public understanding
Multiple Concerns - Duxbury Reef

- Allowed take
- Intertidal MPAs
- Confusing boundaries
- Multiple zoning
Designation concerns

Estuary SMRs should use SMRMAs where waterfowl hunting occurs.
Regulation concerns

Fishery management
- Russian River SMCA (2-XA)
  - Only restricts the take of salmon
  - Acts as a fishery management measure
- Remedies
  - Eliminate the MPA from the proposal
  - Change take allowances
  - Use salmon fishery regulations

Designation concerns
- Russian River (Estuary) SMRMA
  - Waterfowl hunting has not occurred in several years use SMR
Goals and Objectives (G&O)

• NCC regional goals and objectives
  – Developed by NCCRSRG
  – Regional goals adopted from MLPA
  – Objectives specifically crafted for MPAs and region
  – Considered and selected as MPAs were developed

• Purpose of goals and objectives
  – Collectively fulfil MLPA goals and network objectives
  – Drive MPA design (geographic placement, boundaries, regulations, designation)
  – Guide future monitoring activities and evaluation
  – Influence future adaptive management
Goals and Objectives (G&O)

- Evaluation overview
  - Examines compatibility of proposed MPAs with stated objectives
  - Provides recommendations to fix incompatibility
  - Intent to help ensure MPAs are successful and advance intent of MLPA
### Example of content

- **Table and document with Yellow and Grey highlights**

- **Yellow** = one type of activity is incompatible with objectives - Department recommends fixing the goals and objectives or allowed uses

- **Grey** = multiple activities hinder meeting intent of MLPA or science guidelines - Department recommends removing these MPAs

### Table: Goals and Objectives Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>(Proposal) MPA</th>
<th>Conflicts with specified allowed take</th>
<th>Not applicable for type of MPA</th>
<th>Not applicable at scale of Individual MPA</th>
<th>Other Concern</th>
<th>Options to Remedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point Arena</td>
<td>(1-3) Point Arena SMR</td>
<td>G2-04</td>
<td>G4-02, G6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delete all problematic goals/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1-3) Point Arena SMCA</td>
<td>G1-01, G1-05</td>
<td>G4-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delete all problematic goals/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2-XA) Point Arena SMR</td>
<td>G1-04</td>
<td>G4-02, G5-02, G6-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delete all problematic goals/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2-XA) Point Arena SMCA</td>
<td>G1-04</td>
<td>G1-01, G1-05</td>
<td>G4-02, G5-02, G6-01, G6-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delete all problematic goals/objective; or • Delete G1-01, G1-05, G4-02, G5-02, G6-01, G6-02, and disallow take of pelagic finfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Point Arena SMR, Sea Lion Cove SMCA</td>
<td>G4-02, G5-02, G6-01, G6-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delete all problematic goals/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Point Arena SMCA</td>
<td>G1-01, G1-05</td>
<td>G4-02, G5-02, G6-01, G6-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delete all problematic goals/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders Reef</td>
<td>(1-3) Saunders Reef SMCA</td>
<td>G1-02, G1-03</td>
<td>G4-02, G5-02</td>
<td>G5-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Eliminate MPA; or • Delete G4-02, G5-02, G5-03 and reduce allowed take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Saunders Reef SMCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>G4-02, G5-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Eliminate MPA; or • Delete all problematic goals/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar Landing</td>
<td>(1-3) Del Mar Landing SMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G3-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Eliminate MPA; or • Reduce allowed take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Del Mar Landing SMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G5-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Eliminate MPA; or • Delete all problematic goals/objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most common problem (~75%)

• Application at inappropriate scale or to inappropriate MPA type
  – Example: Network objective applied to an MPA
    G5-O2: “For all MPAs in the region involve interested parties to help develop objectives, a long term monitoring plan…”
  – Example: Inappropriate objective applied to an SMR
    G2-O4: “Protect selected species…while allowing harvest…through use of state marine conservation areas and state marine parks” (inappropriate for SMR)

• Suggested remedy: Delete problematic objectives
G&O Concerns: Conflicting Take

• One type of allowed activity/take conflicts with objective(s) and/or narrative reason for establishing MPA

• Example:
  Narrative reason for establishing MPA and selecting G1-04: “Protect natural trophic structure and food webs, including pelagic finfish that serve as prey for other fish, marine birds & marine mammals”

  Conflicting allowed take: Pelagic finfish
G&O Concerns: Conflicting Take

- Proposed MPAs with single conflicting take
  - Point Arena SMCA (2-XA)
  - Black Point SMCA (2-XA)
  - Bodega Head SMCA (1-3 and 2-XA)
  - Point Reyes SMCA (All)
  - Pillar Point SMCA (2-XA)
  - SE Farallon SMCA (2-XA)

- Suggested remedies
  - Delete problematic objective(s), or
  - Remove allowed take in question
Designing Protection

MPAs unnecessary to fulfill the MLPA mandate and with inadequate protection

- Allows most existing take to continue
- Conflicts with intent of MLPA
- Does not provide true improvement to MPA network
- Remedies
  - Reduce the allowed take
  - Eliminate the MPA from the proposal
• MPAs unnecessary to fulfill the MLPA mandate and/or with inadequate protection
  – Sauder’s Reef SMCA (1-3 & 4)
  – Del Mar Landing SMP (1-3)
  – Salt Point SMP (4)
  – Double Point SMCA (1-3)
  – Duxbury SMP (2-XA)
  – Duxbury SMCA (4)
  – Agate Beach Intertidal SMCA (4)
  – Montara SMCA (1-3)
  – San Gregorio SMR (4)
Most Special Closures meet Department guidelines

Concerns

• Shore access
  – Pebble Beach/ Bean Hollow (1-3)
  – Point Resistance (1-3 & 2-XA)

• Boundary distance
  – Point Resistance (1-3)
    [500’ vs recommended 300’ or 1000’]
Design to Support Monitoring/Adaptive Management

- Preferred cluster design: North/south orientation
- Consider other feasibility or goal and objectives concerns

Fitzgerald (2-XA)  Fitzgerald (4)
Design to Support Monitoring/Adaptive Management

- Preferred cluster design: North/south orientation
- Consider other feasibility or goal and objectives concerns

Fitzgerald (1-3)  Fitzgerald (2-XA)  Fitzgerald (4)
Design to Support Monitoring/Adaptive Management

- **Preferred cluster design:** North/south orientation
- Designed to achieve certain objectives

Bodega Head (2-XA)
Design to Support Monitoring/Adaptive Management

- Preferred cluster design: North/south orientation
- Design configurations achieve different objectives
- Consider feasibility/public understanding/enforcement concerns

Bodega Head (1-3)

Bodega Head (2-XA)

Bodega Head (4)
Summary of Department Recommendations

• Recommends the BRTF revise goals and objectives for all proposals forwarded;

• Recommends adjustments in BRTF preferred alternative to meet feasibility concerns;

• Recommends eliminating from proposals MPAs that do not meet the intent of the MLPA